

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-25 remain in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application

#### **Claim Rejections:**

***Claims 1, 8-10 were rejected under 35U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Menard et al. (3,734,869).***

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of “a bump stop for triggering a ratcheting function. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment is found on page 3, line 12 to page 4, lines 3 of the specification. As indicated on page 2 of the Office Action dated December 23, 2006 the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the bump stop triggering a ratcheting function.

Claim 8 has similarly been amended to clarify that “the bump stop is triggering a ratcheting function. Claims 9 and 10 are dependent claims providing further limitations to what is believed to be an allowable claim 8, as amended, and hence are also in condition for allowance.

The Menard reference relates to mechanical details of a rotary switch. Menard is limited to physically moving the limit points, and does not teach or suggest a bump stop triggering a ratcheting function.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 8-10 is overcome.

#### **Allowable subject Matter**

Claims 4-7, 11-24 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowed claims.

**Claims 2 and 3 and 25**

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner did not identify whether claims 2, 3 and 25 were allowed. However, in view of the fact that claim 2 recites the bump stop “triggering a ratcheting function” Applicants believe that claims 2 and 3 are also in condition for allowance. Claim 25 depends on an allowed claim 24 and hence is in condition for allowance as well.

Accordingly, claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance are in condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant’s attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117,  
Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

May 14, 2007

Motorola, Inc.  
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard  
Law Department – MD1610  
Plantation, Florida 33322  
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/  
Barbara R. Doutre  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 39,505  
Tel.: 954-723-6449  
Fax: 954-723-3871  
E-Mail: [docketing.florida@motorola.com](mailto:docketing.florida@motorola.com)